CHA920030010US1

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Y. N. Doganata :	GROUP ART UNIT 2168
Serial No.: 10/664,450 :	Examiner: M. H. Dwiviedi
Filed: 09/20/2003 :	August 11, 2009
Title: Method of Self Enhancement of:	James E. Murray
Search ResultsThrough Analysis of :	207 Dogwood Court
System Logs :	Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Record of Interview Under 37 CFR Section 1.133

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants' attorney thanks the Examiner for the courteous interview. While no agreement was reached, it provided the applicants' attorney with an opportunity to present his position on the timeliness of evidence submitted for the above-identified application. Under section 706.01(A)(3) of the MPEP evidence is considered timely if filed after Final Rejection but before or on the date of Appeal upon showing a good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or evidence is necessary and not presented earlier in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116(e). Both the submitted Kim affidavit and the applicants' attorney had both been filed before Appeal (on 1/6/09 and 4/29/09). Therefore the submissions were timely in accordance with the MPEP requirements as were other

submissions accompanying the last amendment since they were all submitted prior to Appeal. In addition, applicants' attorney brought up the issue that the sections cited by the Examiner did not cover applicants' invention. The disclosure on pages 4 and 5 of the Donagata article deals with extracting terms from a large collection of documents and not with examining failed search terms in a search log. The Examiner stated that he had discussed the rejection with his Manager, Tim Ho, and he was familiar with the issues and had no objections to the contacting of him to discuss the application.

Applicants' acknowledge the receipt of the Examiner's communication about the interview.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Murray – Attorney

Reg. No. 20,915

Phone: (845) 337-3199